FINAL REPORT
AGING SERVICES STUDY

As Required By

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NUMBER 28
OF THE 47TH LEGISLATURE

LEGISLATIVE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Helena, Montana
January, 1983

STATE OF MONTANA

LEGISLATIVE FINANCE COMMITTEE

STATE CAPITOL
HELENA, MONTANA 59620
406/449-2986

January 3, 1983

Members of the 48th Legislature:

This is the final report on the study of services to Montana's aged population. It is presented in compliance with Senate Joint Resolution 28 of the 47th Legislature. The study concludes that the area agency administrative structure is an efficient means of providing aging services and is accountable to the people it serves. Also, the area plans adopted by the area agencies are efficient and meaningful. However, the report also indicates that several problems exist in the relationships of some area agencies and their respective local government funding sources. This report provides an outline of the nature of these problems and presents documentation supporting the efficiency, accountability, and meaningfulness of area agencies and the area plans for providing aging serives.

Senator Ed B. Smith, Chairman
Legislative Finance Committee

FINAL REPORT

AGING SERVICES STUDY

As Required By

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NUMBER 28

OF THE 47TH LEGISLATURE

LEGISLATIVE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Helena, Montana

January, 1983

PREFACE

This report documents the findings of the Legislative Finance Committee in its study of services to Montana's aged population. The study is the result of legislative concern expressed through Senate Joint Resolution 28 of the Forty-Seventh Legislature.

The Legislative Finance Committee is a twelve-member, bipartisan, joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives. It was created in 1975 as a permanent committee to oversee, study, and review financial matters of the state that are relevant to issues of policy and statewide importance. The committee appoints and employs the Legislative Fiscal Analyst who provides staff support for the committee. At least 8 of the 12 members of the Legislative Finance Committee are selected from appropriation committees of the Legislature.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

In 1974, the Community Services Division of SRS established six area agencies on aging to develop and promote aging services to Montana's elderly population. In 1975, the seventh area agency was organized to provide services to the Indian reservations.

During the 1981 legislative session, HB 755 was introduced. If passed it would have dissolved the seven-area aging agency structure and made the state a single planning and service area administered by the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services. The state then would have funded each county directly. Instead of passing HB 755, the 1981 Legislature by Senate Joint Resolution 28, requested the Legislative Finance Committee to

> "...study the efficiency of the seven area agencies on aging and the state aging services bureau in Montana and their accountability to the people they serve;"
>
> "... review the efficiency and meaningfulness of the plans adopted by the area agencies and approved by the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services;" and
>
> "... evaluate to what extent meaningful cooperation exists between the area agencies and their respective local government funding sources."

This report summarizes the information and testimony presented to the committee about the three assignments in Senate Joint Resolution 28. The efficiency and accountability of the area agencies are addressed by examining the organizational structure and functions of the agencies. Pertinent financial information regarding the financial aspects of the agencies' operations is also provided.

The efficiency and meaningfulness of the area and state plans are discussed in sections addressing each of these areas and in a section reporting the findings of a study conducted by the Montana Center of Gerontology at Montana State University.

Following this, the current controversy in the area agency administrative structure and the attendant problems that exist in the relationships of some area agencies and their respective local government funding sources are discussed.

Finally, the closing section presents the conclusions and recommendations reached by the committee as regards this program.

Organization

In fiscal year 1981, there were seven area aging agencies. In fiscal year 1982, four counties--Cascade, Hill, Flathead, and Missoula--applied to be designated as separate planning and service areas for fiscal 1983. Their applications were at first denied by the director of SRS because it was felt that increasing the number of planning and service areas would also increase the administrative structure and costs. An appeal of this decision was made to the SRS fair hearings officer who overturned the director's decision. The hearings officer determined that the economic and financial burden on the counties would not increase if they were designated planning and service areas. Consequently, these counties began operating as separate and independent planning and service areas at the beginning of fiscal 1983. Table 1 below shows the location of the seven area agencies and the four county offices.

Table 1
Location of the Seven Area Agencies and Four County Offices
for Fiscal Year 1983

Area	Name	Location
Area I	Action for Eastern Montana	Glendive
Area II	Area II Agency on Aging	Roundup
Area III	Northern Central Area on Aging	Conrad
Area IV	Rocky Mountain Development Council	Helena
Area V	Area V Agency on Aging	Anaconda
Area VI	Western Montana Area Agency on Aging	Kalispell*
Area VII	Tribal Elders Program (Includes all reservations except Flathead which is part of Area VI in Kalispell)	Billings
Cascade		Great Falls
Hill		Havre
Flathead		Kalispell
Missoula		Missoula

*Area VI will have to move from Kalispell since the area agency must be located in the planning and service area that it serves.

The area aging agencies affected by the four counties withdrawing are Area III and Area VI. Area III consisted of nine counties: Glacier, Toole, Liberty, Blaine, Choteau, Teton, Pondera, Cascade, and Hill. Area VI had the seven counties of Lincoln, Sanders, Lake, Mineral, Ravalli, Missoula, and Flathead. When the counties withdraw their support in fiscal 1983, Area III will have seven counties and Area VI will have five.

The ultimate responsibility for decisions made by the area agencies rests with a governing or executive board. It hires the area director, sets policy, and approves budgets. There are slight variations but usually the board consists of one county commissioner (or a representative of the commissioners) from each county and one elderly citizen consumer from each county. Each area agency also has an advisory council which includes elderly citizens, the general public, and local officials. They have

advisory power only. In addition to the area agency boards and advisory councils, each county usually has a county council on aging which provides input on county aging programs to the county commissioners.

Area Agencies I and IV are part of the Human Resource Development Councils (HRDC's) in their respective areas. The HRDC in these areas acts as an umbrella agency for social programs affecting the elderly and low income.

Functions

According to federal law, the area agencies cannot provide any direct services. They contract with providers (senior citizen centers, HRDC's, local government entities) to deliver the needed services to the elderly.

The main programs contracted for by the area agencies are congregate nutrition sites, home delivered meals, transportation services, senior center activities, in-home services, and information and referral services.

The area agency's responsibilities include the following:

1) Develop and administer an area plan for a comprehensive and coordinated service delivery system;

2) Assess the types and levels of services needed by older persons and conduct public hearings for such purposes;

3) Enter into contracts to provide services to the elderly;

4) Provide technical assistance to, evaluate the performance of, and monitor all service providers;

5) Coordinate the administration of its plan with other federal, state, and local programs;

6) Provide outreach to identify older persons and to inform them of available services;

7) Assure that older persons have reasonable and convenient access to information and referral services; and

8) Monitor, evaluate, and comment on all policies, programs, hearings, levies, and community actions which affect older persons.

Financial Information

Funding Formula

The state agency (SRS), after consultation with all area agencies, must develop and use an intrastate funding formula to distribute federal aging funds. The federal statute requires the formula to include the following items:

1. An identical base subgrant to each area agency in the state;
2. An allocation to rural areas in the state of at least 105 percent of the amount spent under Titles III, V, and VII of the Older Americans Act during federal fiscal year 1978 for services in rural areas in the 1978 federal fiscal year;
3. A reflection of the proportion of persons age 60 and over among the planning and service areas in the state; and
4. A reflection of the proportion of persons age 60 and over among the planning and service areas of persons age 60 and over in greatest economic or social need.

Since the creation of area agencies, two funding formulas have been used. Each method is described below.

1. Funding formula used for fiscal 1982 and earlier:

   A. Allocate the 8½ percent of Title III B federal funds (social services) allowed for area agency administration equally to all area

agencies. This meets the identical base subgrant requirement for all area agencies.

B. Allocate Title III-C1 (congregate nutrition) funds by the previous year's level (protection of a "grandfather clause"). Allocate Titles III-C2 (home nutrition) and the program portion of Title III-B to the area agencies by a 60/20/20 formula. Sixty percent (60%) is based on the total age 60 and over population in the planning and service area, 20 percent is based on the total low income age 60 and over population in the planning and service area, and 20 percent is based on the total minority age 60 and over population in the planning and service area.

2. The funding formula to be used in fiscal 1983 is more complex to take account of the existence of three planning and service areas - Cascade, Hill and Flathead counties - not associated with an area agency. (Missoula County, while applying for and receiving designation as a separate planning and service area, has also established its own area agency, making a total of eight area agencies in the state and eleven planning and service areas.) These planning and service areas will not receive administrative funding under the same rules as planning and service areas associated with area agencies. Funding formula to be used for fiscal 1983:

A. Planning and service areas associated with area agencies will have the option of taking either:

(1) a base amount of $20,000; or

(2) the total of

(a) 111B - $10,000 plus 3.547 percent of balance of 111B funds,

(b) 111C1 - $10,000 plus 4.990 percent of balance of 111C1 funds,

(c) 111C2 - 8.5 percent of the total, and

(d) General Fund - 8.5 percent of the total, for area agency administration.

B. Each planning and service area will receive a base amount determined by county population(s) aged 60 and above for all counties in the planning and service area.

C. The balance of all federal and state funds will be distributed across planning and service areas on the basis of:

(1) 70 percent on the basis of 60 plus population;

(2) 20 percent on the basis of 60 plus low-income population; and

(3) 10 percent on the basis of 60 plus minority population.

D. Whereas the 1970 census was used for the funding formula for fiscal 1982 and earlier, the 1980 census was used for the fiscal 1983 allocation. Also, the "grandfather clause" used in 1982 was not applicable in 1983.

Table 2 on page 8 shows the distribution of funds for fiscal 1982 using the old distribution formula.

Table 3 on page 9 shows the distribution of funds for fiscal 1983 using the new funding formula. Both tables indicate only the general fund and federal funds that SRS distributes to the area agencies and the four counties. They do not include income or other funds the area agencies or the counties may receive.

As shown, there are $2,875,603 of federal funds and $293,418 of state funds in fiscal 1983. General fund is about ten percent of the total dollars.

Table 2
The Fiscal Year 1982 Budget for the Seven Area Aging Agencies

	Area I	Area II	Area III	Area IV	Area V	Area VI	Area VII	Total
Expenditures								
Administration	$ 36,226	$ 43,861	$ 44,112	$ 31,813	$ 36,664	$ 47,498	$ 29,133	$ 269,307
Program Benefits	390,539	532,332	532,302	310,487	372,257	599,750	246,354	2,984,021
Total Expend.	$426,765	$576,193	$576,414	$342,300	$408,921	$647,248	$275,487	$3,253,328
Funds								
Federal Funds	$388,641	$524,179	$525,034	$304,087	$376,149	$588,645	$253,165	$2,959,900
General Fund	25,344	34,580	34,160	18,756	21,788	38,960	14,840	188,428
Information & Referral (General Fund)	12,780	17,434	17,220	19,457	10,984	19,643	7,482	105,000
Total Funds	$426,765	$576,193	$576,414	$342,300	$408,921	$647,248	$275,487	$3,253,328

*This table does not include funds the area agencies receive from the local communities.
Source: The Department of SRS.

Table 3
Fiscal 1983 Budget for the Seven Area Aging Agencies and the Four Counties

	Area I	Area II	Area III	Area IV	Area V	Area VI	Area VII	Cascade	Flathead	Hill	Missoula	Total
Expenditures												
Administrative	$ 40,217	$ 45,211	$ 28,997	$ 35,195	$ 36,260	$ 20,000	$ 28,493	$ -0-	$ -0-	$ -0-	$ 25,994	$ 260,367
Program Benefits	409,413	544,634	188,466	318,992	348,966	327,666	183,499	222,197	137,536	100,280	127,005	2,908,654
Total Expend.	$449,630	$589,845	$217,463	$354,187	$385,226	$347,666	$211,992	$222,197	$137,536	$100,280	$152,999	$3,169,021
Funding												
Federal	$413,066	$535,099	$197,273	$313,769	$352,244	$317,600	$194,568	$198,127	$121,944	$ 94,929	$136,984	$2,875,603
General Fund	24,308	36,396	14,334	20,222	21,927	20,968	11,584	15,262	9,912	3,388	10,127	188,428
Information & Referral (GF)	12,256	18,350	5,856	20,196	11,055	9,098	5,840	8,808	5,680	1,963	5,888	104,990
Total Funds	$449,630	$589,845	$217,463	$354,187	$385,226	$347,666	$211,992	$222,197	$137,536	$100,280	$152,999	$3,169,021

*This table does not include funds the area agencies receive from local communities.
Source: The Department of SRS.

Financial Information

The area aging agencies contract with providers for the following services: congregate nutrition sites, home delivered meals, transportation services, senior center activities, in-home services, and information and referral services. Each area is unique in its method of providing these services. This makes compairson of one area agency to another in fulfilling their responsibilities difficult except on a very general level.

Tables 4 and 5 compare area agency administrative and program costs based on the financial information available. Table 4 shows the administrative expenses for each area agency for fiscal year 1981.

Table 4
Administrative Costs of each Area Aging Agency
for Fiscal Year 1981

	Fiscal 1981						
	Area I	Area II	Area III	Area IV	Area V	Area VI	Area VII
Expenditures							
Personal Serv.	$28,693	$36,375	$43,390	$35,055	$28,967	$55,289	N/A
Operating Exp.	20,508	16,880	21,512	9,108	6,517	16,657	N/A
Equipment	438	1,350	345	-0-	-0-	597	N/A
Total Expend.	$49,639	$54,605	$65,247	$44,163	$35,484	$72,543	N/A
Funding							
Local Participation	$12,513	$15,992	$15,643	$11,186	$ 8,871	$18,530	N/A
Federal & State	37,126	38,613	49,604	32,977	26,613	54,013	N/A
Total Funds	$49,639	$54,605	$65,247	$44,163	$35,484	$72,543	N/A
% of Elderly Population	13.81	19.51	17.85	12.10	13.83	21.44	1.46

Source: This information is from the fiscal 1981 year-end "Monthly Financial Reports" submitted to SRS by the area agencies.

Table 5 shows the program funds each area received in fiscal 1981. It also indicates the percentage of the elderly population in each area agency.

Table 5
Program Expenditures for each Area Agency
in Fiscal 1981

	Federal Funds	Income	Other	Total Funds	% of Elderly Population
Area IV	$ 349,460	$148,399	$107,720	$ 605,579	12.10
Area I	300,278	120,155	190,794	611,227	13.81
Area V	498,200	79,178	122,051	699,429	13.83
Area III	592,548	231,502	262,136	1,086,186	17.85
Area II	551,965	153,860	143,506	849,331	19.51
Area VI	576,543	181,809	132,160	90,512	21.44
Area VII	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.46
Total*	$2,868,994	$914,903	$958,367	$4,742,264	100.00

*Excludes funding for Area VII.
Source: This financial information was compiled from quarterly area aging agency reports.

The ranking by distribution of total funds follows that by percent of elderly population in the area agency, except for Area III. Area III generates the most "income" and "other funds" making the total funds they utilize out of line with their percentage of the population. Thus, much of the difference in funding for the programs can be explained by the "income" and "other" funds the areas receive. "Income" is what recipients of the service have donated to the program, and "other" is mainly county funds.

Table 6 indicates the administrative and program expenditures for fiscal 1981. It also shows what percent administrative expenses were of

the total area agency expenditures. The administrative percentages range from 4.83 percent in Area V to 7.53 percent in Area I. The average for all the area agencies was 6.35 percent.

Table 6
Percentage of Administration Costs of the Total Funds Received
(Includes County and Income Funds)

Area I	Administrative Expenditures	Program Expenditures	Total	Percent of Administration
I	$ 49,639	$ 611,227	$ 660,866	7.51
II	54,605	849,331	903,936	6.43
III	65,247	1,086,186	1,151,433	5.67
IV	44,163	605,578	649,742	7.29
V	35,484	699,429	734,913	4.83
VI	72,543	890,512	963,055	7.53
VII	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	$321,681	$4,742,263	$5,063,945	6.35

Service and Financial Information Accountability

An attempt was made to collect service and financial information that would indicate cost per service for each area agency. Financial information in this form could not be collected by every area agency without a great deal of difficulty. Some of the major problems encountered are listed, though not every problem listed was at each area agency:

(1) the area agencies budgeted each service by fund, but actual expenditures were reported from the local projects as a total line item and not specified by service. Therefore, an actual cost per service was not readily available without extensive work by the individual projects.

(2) The units of service are not necessarily counted consistently between area agencies. A unit of service at one project or area agency may be different than at another project or area agency.

(3) There is some question on the total cost of a project or services. Many counties and persons provide volunteer and in-kind services for area agencies and elderly programs which are not always reported. These types of services are difficult to determine and compare between projects and area agencies.

(4) There was a noticeable lack of consistency in the methods of bookkeeping for funds and services. The state and federal government let the local people receiving the funds develop their own methods of collecting and recording information. This naturally resulted in many different ways of doing things making comparisons of information difficult.

As of October, 1981, a new financial form developed by the state is being used to report aging program fiscal and service/recipient information. The funds are not only budgeted by service, but actual expenditures are reported by service. This should alleviate some of the aforementioned concerns.

Area Plans and State Role

Area Plans

A state area plan and individual area aging agency plans are required to be developed by federal statute (The Older Americans Act). This applies to Montana with its seven area aging agencies. States which have no area agencies, but are a single planning and service area, only need a state plan. An area plan is developed and submitted by an area aging agency to the state agency (SRS) in order to receive state and federal funds. The area plans are then incorporated into a state plan. The plan documents are from the federal government. They contain specific objectives and responsibilities that are required by the federal government in

order to be designated an area agency. The federal government specifies the objectives and goals that must be contained in each area aging agency's plan and the state plan; however, the way in which the objectives are to be achieved is the responsibility of each area agency and depends on their unique characteristics and resources. The governing or executive board of the area agency with community input decides how the prescribed objectives can be met in their areas. Such decisions as whether or not a program is needed, the amount of funding to commit to a program, and the appropriate provider to deliver the services must be decided and acted upon by the executive or governing board of the area agency.

State Role

To evaluate the effectiveness of area aging plans, the state has an evaluation bureau in SRS. The bureau has staff that monitors, reviews, and makes recommendations on area aging agency plans. It currently uses three instruments in assessing the area aging agency's progress in meeting the required federal objectives and state concerns. The instruments are as listed:

(1) Area Agency Compliance Review of Management and Planning Responsibilities. This evaluates an area aging agency's compliance with federally mandated responsibilities as indicated in the Older Americans Act.

(2) Review of Area Agency Progress in Achieving Area Plan Objectives. This analysis shows how an area aging agency is proceeding with the methods it has developed to meet the objectives in its area plan.

(3) Project Evaluation Guide for Aging Services Project. This was developed by SRS staff and is not a federal requirement. It is used to determine the extent to which a local project is fulfilling provider responsibilities, the quality of service, and the cost effectiveness of the services. (This form has just begun to be utilized.)

The federal government has established specific objectives for an area aging agency. The agency does not have a choice but must pursue the objectives if they are to receive federal aging funds. However, the agency does have some discretion in how these objectives are attained. This provides the opportunity for county officials, recipients of the services, and other interested parties to participate in designing programs to meet the mandated objectives. The plan should then be meaningful to each individual area and a reflection of each area's needs and concerns. This reflection of area needs is then monitored through state evaluations of the area aging agencies. The evaluations are performed every six months on each area aging agency; based on these evaluations, recommendations are made. The evaluations performed for fiscal year 1981 indicate that the area agencies are in the process of complying with their area plan objectives and state recommendations or have already complied for that year. The evaluations are an ongoing process with state staff checking each recommendation that has been made to insure compliance. Many of the recommendations by state staff suggest different methods of attaining an objective or accomplishing a particular goal. Seldom do the recommendations indicate that an area agency is grossly ignoring its area plan and objectives. Also, many of the recommendations concern technical aspects of complying with the law of which the area agencies may not be aware. In most cases, the area agencies are receptive to the recommendations.

MSU Study - Accountability and Meaningfulness of Services to the Elderly

The Montana Center of Gerontology at Montana State University (MSU) in Bozeman, Montana, conducted a study titled, Older Montanans: Their Characteristics, Problems, and Needs for Services. The study was commissioned by the Community Services Division of the Department of Social

and Rehabilitation Services and was finished in the summer of 1981. It was designed to "provide an overall picture of the general characteristics and problems of older people in Montana, along with an assessment of their needs for assistance and the sources of help utilized in meeting those needs."

Modern statistical techniques were employed making it possible to survey about 1 percent of the people 60 and over and have the results apply to the total elderly population in Montana. The study was very comprehensive on the makeup and needs of Montana's elderly citizens. For the purpose of this report, only a few of the results have been utilized. They do, however, generally indicate the needs and concerns of Montana's elderly population and their attitudes about the services available to them.

Table 7 indicates 11 of the different kinds of problems that affect the elderly and what percent of the elderly in Montana have the problems listed.

Table 7
General Problems as Indicated by Montana Elderly Citizens

Type of Problem	No Problem	Some Problem	Very Important Problem	Most Serious Problem
Health	43%	35%	19%	14%
Income (Money)	69%	19%	9%	6%
Transportation	79%	11%	6%	3%
Understanding Legal Matters	63%	27%	4%	2%
Loneliness	70%	19%	5%	2%
Securing Fuel and/or Energy	83%	9%	3%	1%
Crime	83%	6%	1%	--
Spare Time Activities	84%	7%	2%	--
Age Discrimination	85%	3%	1%	--
Nutrition and Food	89%	5%	1%	--
Housing	92%	2%	1%	--
No Serious Problem	69%			

*The figures in the four columns do not sum to 100% because the rating of a problem as "most serious" was a separate question. The figures in the other three columns would sum to 100% except for the missing data caused by those who did not answer the question.

Source: Montana Center of Gerontology - Older Montanans: Their Characteristics, Problems, and Needs for Services.

As shown, 69 percent of the elderly citizens in Montana had "no serious problem" with the 11 problems that are listed. In addition health was the only category in which a majority of the respondents had a problem (over 50 percent).

Table 8 takes the main types of general problems in Table 7 and shows the distribution of them by each area agency.

Table 8
Main Types of Problems in Each Aging Area*

Type Problem	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	Total
	Aging Area							
Health	48%	52%	56%	56%	53%	56%	37%	54%
Money	27%	34%	24%	30%	27%	27%	59%	28%
Transportation	16%	19%	18%	17%	14%	16%	26%	17%
Loneliness	23%	24%	27%	23%	22%	24%	27%	24%
Legal Matters	24%	26%	41%	32%	29%	27%	43%	31%

*Ratings of "some problem" and "very important problem" are combined to make up the totals of respondents who named a particular problem.

Source: Montana Center of Gerontology - Older Montanans: Their Characteristics, Problems, and Needs for Services.

The type of problem by area agency seems to be pretty uniform (excluding reservations). Health had a range of 48 percent to 56 percent. Money had a range of 24 percent to 34 percent. Transportation had a range of 14 percent to 19 percent, and loneliness had a range of 23 percent to 27 percent. Problems with legal matters are a little more varied by area agency with a range of 24 percent to 41 percent.

Table 9 presents program participation by the different area agencies. Thirty-nine percent of the respondents participate in "senior centers" and 32 percent participate in "nutrition site" programs.

Table 9
Program Participation in Different Aging Areas*

Type Program	Aging Area I	II	III	IV	VV	VI	VII	Total
Senior Center	40%	21%	50%	42%	46%	37%	45%	39%
Nutrition Site	33%	15%	40%	41%	24%	30%	26%	32%
Friendly Visiting	24%	10%	21%	29%	16%	14%	13%	19%
Senior Transportation	21%	14%	20%	17%	16%	18%	13%	18%
RSVP	22%	8%	20%	18%	8%	8%	4%	14%
Infor. & Referral	12%	9%	14%	12%	10%	18%	11%	13%
Meals on Wheels	13%	8%	16%	16%	12%	12%	21%	13%

*Programs in which under 10 percent of the total sample have participated are not shown.

Source: Montana Center of Gerontology - Older Montanans: Their Characteristics, Problems, and Needs for Services.

Table 10 shows the types of services needed most by elderly citizens and where they are able to receive the services. As can be seen, most elderly citizens rely on family and friends for the type of services indicated by the table. The only services not fulfilled mainly by friends and family are the specialized services like legal advice, agency advocate, and home nursing.

The next most relied upon source for the required services is an agency or organization (state agency, county agency, churches, etc.).

Table 10
Needs for Service and Sources Utilized

Type of Service*	Agency/ Organization	Private/ Paid	Family/ Friends	Total** Sources Utilized
Checking On	16%	5%	79%	100%
Household Chores	33%	24%	43%	100%
Legal Advice	13%	71%	16%	100%
Escort Service	14%	7%	79%	100%
Information/Referral	44%	16%	40%	100%
Personal Care	35%	19%	46%	100%
Day-Care	24%	18%	58%	100%
Personal Affairs	15%	13%	72%	100%
Agency Advocate	53%	8%	38%	100%
Home Nursing	44%	14%	42%	100%

*Sources of service were not listed for types of service needed by 5% or less of the respondents.

**An additional 2 to 5 persons per each type of service indicated a need for service that was not met.

Source: Montana Center of Gerontology - Older Montanans: Their Characteristics, Problems, and Needs for Services.

Table 11 indicates the types of services needed by the elderly in each of the area agencies. As the table shows for the types of services listed no more than 16 percent of the elders in any of the areas needed a service. In other words the service "checking on" had the greatest demand which was only 16 percent for the area agencies as a whole.

Table 11
Types of Services Needed in Different Aging Areas

Type Service	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	Total	VII
Checking On	21%	21%	12%	13%	17%	17%	16%	18%
Household Chores	15%	18%	9%	18%	14%	19%	15%	15%
Legal Advice	20%	18%	7%	13%	4%	22%	15%	12%
Escort Service	13%	16%	9%	13%	15%	17%	13%	16%
Information/Referral	18%	17%	7%	10%	4%	14%	12%	1%
Personal Care	9%	12%	7%	12%	11%	9%	10%	7%
Day-Care	7%	12%	9%	9%	2%	6%	8%	11%
Personal Affairs	9%	13%	5%	7%	3%	10%	8%	8%
Agency Advocate	8%	9%	5%	6%	7%	7%	7%	44%
Home Nursing	6%	8%	3%	6%	6%	8%	6%	12%

Source: Montana Center of Gerontology - Older Montanans: Their Characteristics, Problems, and Needs for Services.

The MSU study states that "the Community Services Division and the seven area agencies on aging, through local service providers, have successfully developed and provided services to older Montanans." This is indicated by the previous tables and in general by Table 12 on page 22. It shows the program availability (as perceived by the respondent) and the respondent's participation of services offered by the aging services network (which includes SRS, area aging agencies, county agencies, and other elderly program providers). As is shown, a majority of the programs are available in most areas even though not all the respondents participate.

Table 12
Program Availability and Participation

Type of Program	Program Available In Area	Respondent Had Participated	Would Have Participated If Available
Senior Centers	86%	39%*	45%
Nutrition Sites Program (Senior Hot Lunches)	77%	32%	42%
Friendly Visiting/Visitation	51%	19%	37%
Senior Transportation Services	66%	18%	27%
Retired Senior Volunteer Program	55%	14%	25%
Information & Referral Services	57%	13%	23%
Meals on Wheels (Home Delivered Meals)	73%	13%	18%
Home Repair or Winterization Services (Low Income)	60%	8%	13%
Food Stamps	71%	4%	6%

*Reasons for nonparticipation:
No reason to participate or not interested 33%.
Poor health or disability 4%.
Transportation or distance 2%.
Program characteristics 2%.
No answer 20%.

Source: Montana Center of Gerontology - Older Montanans: Their Characteristics, Problems, and Needs for Services.

Cooperation with Local Government Funding Sources and the Controversy over Administrative Structure

Montana's Aging Services Program is involved in a controversy regarding the appropriate method to administer the program. Prior to July 1, 1982 the program was administered by six multi-county area agencies and a seventh agency that administered the state's Indian tribes. Associated with each of the six multi-county agencies is a governing or executive board, usually consisting of one county commissioner and one elderly, citizen consumer from each county in the area. The board hires the area director, sets policy, and approves budgets. Each area also has an advisory council composed of elderly citizens, the general public, and local officials.

In fiscal 1982, four counties--Hill, Cascade, Flathead, and Missoula--applied to the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services for authority to become separate planning and service areas, independent of their respective area agencies, and eligible for direct funding from the state agency (SRS). While all four counties have been designated as separate planning and service areas (PSA's), only Missoula County has also been designated as an area agency. Federal regulations maintain that

> "A State or area agency must use subgrants or contracts with service providers to provide all services under this part unless the State agency decides that direct provision of a service by the State or area agency using its own employees is necessary to assure an adequate supply of the services."

and further,

> "...direct provision is necessary to assure an adequate supply if the area agency can and will provide the service substantially more effectively and efficiently than any other provider." (CFR45, 1321.103)

Because Missoula County does not directly provide services, but contracts with service providers, it is eligible for area agency status. In addition to the four counties just discussed, several other counties have expressed dissatisfaction with the area agency structure and also have requested to be funded directly in the future.

In the spring of 1982 a survey of county commissioners was conducted. The survey was to determine the general attitudes commissioners had toward the area aging agency structure. Table 13 lists the results of this survey. Of the 26 counties that answered the survey, 16 counties were in favor of the area agency structure and 10 were not in favor of the structure. Generally speaking, the counties in Areas I, III and VI tended to express a larger degree of dissatisfaction with the area agency structure.

Table 13
County Commissioners Attitude Survey

	County Commissioners Support Area Aging Agency		County Commissioners Support Area Aging Agency
Area I		**Area IV**	
1. Carter	---	38. Broadwater	---
2. Custer	yes	39. Gallatin	---
3. Daniels	no	40. Jefferson	---
4. Dawson	---	41. Lewis & Clark	yes
5. Fallon	---	42. Meagher	yes
6. Garfield	no	43. Park	---
7. McCone	---		
8. Phillips	---	**Area V**	
9. Powder River	---	44. Beaverhead	---
10. Prairie	---	45. Deer Lodge	yes
11. Richland	---	46. Granite	---
12. Roosevelt	no	47. Madison	---
13. Rosebud	no	48. Powell	---
14. Sheridan	no	49. Silver Bow	---
15. Treasure	---		
16. Valley	---	**Area VI**	
17. Wibaux	---	50. Flathead	no
		51. Lake	---
Area II		52. Lincoln	---
18. Big Horn	yes	53. Mineral	---
19. Carbon	---	54. Missoula	no
20. Fergus	no	55. Ravalli	yes
21. Golden Valley	yes	56. Sanders	---
22. Judith Basin	yes		
23. Musselshell	yes		
24. Petroleum	---		
25. Stillwater	---		
26. Sweet Grass	---		
27. Wheatland	yes		
28. Yellowstone	2-yes 1-no		
Area III			
29. Blaine	yes		
30. Cascade	---		
31. Choteau	yes		
32. Hill	no		
33. Glacier	---		
34. Liberty	yes		
35. Pondera	yes		
36. Teton	---		
37. Toole	yes		

Through the course of public testimony, the withdrawing counties have stated several reasons for their desire to be funded directly. One primary concern appears to be funds allocation within the area agency. For the most part, area agencies are funded on the basis of relative elderly population. Disbursements of funds within the area, however, rest with the decisions of the governing boards. Because each county is allowed a single vote on the board, regardless of population, larger counties often feel they are not fairly represented. Such representation, it is argued, is translated into inequitable distributions of funds within the area resulting in underfunding of programs in larger counties. Withdrawing counties further argue that while the area board's intentions are generally good, the quality of its decisions suffers from a frequently changing make-up of often poorly informed participants. Other reasons given for movement to independent planning and service area status include:

1. It was felt administrative expenses could be saved if the counties receive the funds directly from the state rather than through the area agencies. This would eliminate administrative duplication. i.e. The four counties wanting area agency designation already have county structures for administering county aging services. In many instances, the area agencies contracted the services to these already existing county aging structures.

2. Many counties feel they can determine the needs of their elderly citizens at a local level better than through an area agency not in the community. The area agency is too far away to be familiar with everyday problems and concerns.

3. Counties can take greater advantage of local financial resources than can the area agency. This is especially true if financial supporters feel the funds they are contributing will stay within the community.

4. Elderly citizens will have better access to the persons making the decisions on elderly services since they will be community people, specifically the county commissioners.

5. There would be better coordination of county services. There are many county programs which can be utilized to better serve the elderly population. Area agencies do not have the time or funds for this. It can be done most effectively at the local and county level.

Opponents of individual county withdrawal from the planning and service area have argued that under the area agency concept programs have been efficiently administered and have provided for a proliferation of services. They also view area agencies as focal points for advocacy and assistance that would be lost in their absence. (Appendix A provides a detailed summary of written testimony received prior to and during the September 3, 1982 hearing on aging services.) Other reasons given for maintaining the area agency structure include:

1. Administrative costs are less if each county does not have to employ its own county staff for aging programs. Small counties do not always have adequate staff to perform additional functions.

2. The state would require additional staff to deal with all 56 counties separately. Currently, area agencies provide administrative and technical assistance not available in many counties. During the 1981 session, SRS indicated they would require about five additional FTE if the state were designated as a single state planning and service area.

3. Services for elderly citizens are better coordinated under an area structure rather than when counties are funded individually. If the elderly population in an area needs services, the resources available to the area agency as a whole can be utilized.

4. In their letters to the area agency, many smaller counties support the area agency structure. Larger counties do contribute more funds to support the area agency than do smaller counties. However, larger counties benefit from the trade they receive from the smaller counties. Both receive mutual benefits.

5. Without the support of the larger counties, the smaller counties would not be able to support an area agency. The larger counties pulling out of the area agency would be at the expense of the smaller counties.

6. If the counties are allowed to be designated as area agencies, how will the funds be distributed? If distributed by population, will the allotment to many smaller counties be enough to provide for administration and services?

This report examines three alternatives available in administering aging services and indicates the advantages and disadvantages associated with each. These three alternatives are: continue with the status quo, have a single state planning and service area, or limit the number of planning and service areas.

Alternative 1. Continue with the Status Quo

The first alternative is to continue with the status quo, which would allow any unit of local government the opportunity to make application to the state agency for independent planning and service area designation. Authority for such application is maintained in federal regulations CFR45, 1321.53 which state that "The state agency must provide an opportunity to apply to be designated as a planning and service area to any unit of general purpose local government, region, metropolitan area, or Indian reservation(s)." At the same time, however, the Office of the Commissioner on Aging has expressed its opinion that the intent of federal regulations is that all designated PSA's must be affiliated with area agencies to

be technically in compliance with the regulations. The thrust of this may be found in CFR45, 1321.1 which states that

> "Each state agency designates planning and services areas in the State, and makes a subgrant or contract under an approved area plan to one area agency in each planning and service area. Area agencies in turn make subgrants or contracts to service providers."

This indicates that the original intent of Congress was to insure that each planning and service area would be associated with one area agency on aging.

The advantage of allowing the status quo to continue is that those counties, or groups of counties that wish to apply for PSA status may do so while existing PSA's, content with their make-up and organizational structure, may continue to function as before. A disadvantage to continuing with the status quo is that continuance of the trend towards disaggregation and fragmentation could lead to exorbitant and unjustifiable administrative expense in the absence of restraints on the maximum number of area agencies allowable.

Alternative 2. Single State PSA

A second alternative is to designate the state as a single planning and service area, thereby eliminating the area agency structure. This has been the recommendation of the Governor's Council on Management in their final report published in October of 1982. The immediate advantage of this proposal is the reduction in administrative expense, estimated by the above-mentioned report to be $459,000 annually, which funds can then be used to purchase program goods and services. (In John Bebee's report published May 21, 1982, total general fund and federal funds being spent for area agency administration are reported to be $269,397 in fiscal 1982 and $260,440 in fiscal 1983.)

The distinct disadvantage to this approach is that senior citizens apparently feel that they would lose a strong, active advocate in the absence of area agencies. A great preponderance of testimony received from elderly citizens reveals a strong preference to maintain an area agency structure and a stiff resistance to establishing a single state PSA.

There is some question as to whether the state could at this time successfully apply for and receive single, state PSA status. Federal regulations spelling out the criteria for approval of a single, state PSA state that

> "The Commissioner approves the designation of the State as a single planning and service area if-
>
> (1) No jurisdiction successfully applied for designation as a planning and service area under the procedures specified in 1321.51 through 1321.55; and
>
> (2) The State agency demonstrates that-
>
> (i) The State is not already divided for purposes of planning and administering human services; or
>
> (ii) The State is so small or rural that the purposes of this part would be frustrated if the State were divided into planning and service areas; and
>
> (iii) The State Agency has the capabilities to carry out the responsibilities of the area agency specified in Subparts E, F, and G for the entire state.

It has been argued in other states that the single state PSA form of administrative structure is the most appropriate when dealing with states of a predominantly rural nature. North Dakota, South Dakota and Wyoming, all of which employ the single state PSA concept, have been cited as practical examples. While North Dakota and South Dakota have been single, state PSA's since the inception of the program, Wyoming has applied for and has been granted single state PSA status within the last year. Prior to becoming a single state PSA, Wyoming was divided into two

PSA's who contracted directly with service providers. In Wyoming there was very little opposition to move to the single state PSA form. In contrast to Wyoming, Montana currently has eleven PSA's, and opposition to the single state PSA structure.

Should the single state PSA structure be approved by the federal government, there are two administrative options that could be implemented. The first option is for SRS to allocate funds to the counties. The second option is for SRS to contract directly with service providers.

Under the first option, funds would be distributed to the counties directly on the basis of an intrastate funding formula. However, opposition at the grass-roots level to the idea of a single state PSA stems in great part from the notion that senior citizens would automatically be forced to become associated with the stigma of welfare because the elderly feel the program would more than likely be administered through the county welfare offices.

A second option would involve funding similar to that occuring in North Dakota and Wyoming where project directors make application to the state agency for state and federal funding directly and receive funding directly back from the state agency. All intervention at the county level is by-passed. The level at which the county wishes to participate financially would still be controlled by the county through mill levy adjustments and community services block grant fund disbursement policies. All area agency administrative costs are eliminated.

Alternative 3. Limited Number of PSA's

The third alternative is to limit the number of area agencies that could exist at any one time. The Department of Social and Rehablitation Services has suggested that under this approach no more than ten PSA's

should be allowed to exist at once. Single counties desiring to be a PSA would need to have an area agency but could be provided with a waiver allowing the area agency to provide services directly. SRS has suggested that these single counties not share in the pool of state and federal administrative funds. SRS states that counties requesting to be single county PSA's generally have argued that county administrative costs would not rise because they already have the capacity to absorb the program locally.

Other considerations in the designation of PSA's might include:

1. The minimum number of elderly citizens in each PSA. (Appendix B shows the distributions of the population of persons aged 60 and above for counties and area agencies.)

2. The amount of land and travel distance for each PSA.

3. The minimum number of contiguous counties required in a PSA.

Conclusions and Summary

After considering the evidence presented herein and testimony received during several meetings and public hearings, the committee has reached the following conclusions.

A. EFFICIENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF AREA AGENCIES

The committee concludes that area agencies are efficient and accountable to the people they serve, and continues to endorse the area agency concept. Efficiency is guaged by the cost associated with area agency administration as a percent of total program costs. In fiscal 1981 these costs ranged from 4.83 percent in Area V to 7.53 percent in Area I, with an average across all agencies of 6.35 percent. The Code of Federal Regulations, 1321.193(c), provides that "The State agency may not award more than 8.5 percent of the total of its combined allotments for social and nutrition services for area plan administration."

As regards accountability, each area agency is associated with an executive or governing board made up of local county commissioners and elderly citizen consumers. The board, through consultation with local senior citizens, county officials, service providers, and the area advisory council works with the area agency to develop and submit the area plan to the state agency.

B. EFFICIENCY AND MEANINGFULNESS OF AREA PLANS

The committee further concludes that the area plans are efficient and meaningful. These attributes are reflected in a study conducted by the Montana Center of Gerontology at Montana State University titled Older Montanans: Their Characteristics Problems, and Needs for Services. The report provides an indication of the demand for aging services and the extent to which demands are being met, and concludes that "...the Community Services Division and the seven area agencies on aging, through local service providers, have successfully developed and provided services to older Montanans."

C. EXTENT OF MEANINGFUL COOPERATION BETWEEN AREA AGENCIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUNDING SOURCES

The committee finds that several problems exist in the relationships of some area agencies and their respective local government funding sources. For the most part, these problems appear to stem from differences regarding the appropriate administrative structure to be used in delivering aging services and the resulting distribution of funds that arises as a consequence of alternative administrative structures. The precise nature of these differences is documented in previous sections of the report and in testimony received during the course of several committee meetings and hearings addressing the aging services network.

The committee also recognizes that several counties have expressed dissatisfaction with the existing administrative structure and fears that continued disaggregation through county withdrawal could seriously impair the efficiency and accountability of the aging services network. Testimony indicates that area agency directors are working with Social and Rehabilitation Services department personnel and other interested parties to find solutions to these problems administratively. The department and all interested parties are to provide the committee with reports regarding the progress made in arriving at solutions satisfactory to all concerned.

D. Summary

In conclusion, the committee finds that area agencies are an efficient means of providing services to Montana's aged population and that they are accountable to the people they serve. The committee also feels that the area plans have efficiently and meaningfully provided services needed by senior citizens. The committee endorses the area agency concept.

Finally, while several problems exist between some area agencies and their respective local government funding sources, the nature of these problems warrants no call for legislation at this time. Instead, the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, acting in cooperation with area agencies and county governments, will administratively coordinate the progress towards a mutually acceptable solution for all parties involved that incorporates the development of an efficient and economical administrative area agency model for the state as a whole. If cooperative efforts on the part of all concerned parties fails to produce a solution to these problems prior to the beginning of the next regular session of the Legislature, then legislation appropriate to the solution of these problems should be drafted and presented to the next Legislature for its consideration.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN TESTIMONY - AGING SERVICES HEARING

On September 3, 1982, the Legislative Finance Committee held a public hearing in the auditorium of the Montana Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services building in order to receive testimony from all interested parties regarding the issue of the appropriate administrative structure to be used in the delivery of services to Montana's senior citizens. Discussion focused on whether it is more appropriate to administer the aging services program through an area agency structure similar to that being used at present, or to go to a system in which individual counties would be directly funded under a state administered program.

Written testimony was presented prior to the hearing by those unable to attend and during the hearing by those in attendance. Written testimony was received from 42 sources including county commissioners, area agency directors, members of county councils on aging, senior citizen advocates, directors of senior centers, members of area agency governing boards, and state representatives, as well as several senior citizens. Of the 42 documents, 32 reflected views favoring the area agency structure. The remaining 10 favored direct funding or a system of area agencies that provided for direct funding on a case-by-case basis. Twenty-nine of the 42 documents were received during the course of the hearing, 24 of which favored the area agency structure. A preponderance of written testimony advocating direct funding comes from counties in Area 1, which covers the northeast corner of the state. In particular, Hill, Daniels, Fallon, Phillips, Sheridan, and Roosevelt counties all filed testimony in support of direct funding. The notable exception--Dawson County--continues to support the

area agency structure. Controversy is also strong in Area VI, where Flathead, Lincoln, and Missoula counties have advocated direct funding, and in Area III where Cascade and Hill counties have withdrawn from the area agency structure. Written testimony received to date indicates little controversy in Areas II, IV, V, and VII, which appear to be operating under the area agency structure with little expressed dissastisfaction.

While testimony varied from respondent to respondent, discussion generally revolved around several recurring themes. Testimony from area agency advocates underscored the notion that, when viewed overall, the area agency structure has worked so well in the past that to change it now would do more harm than good. Supporting this view is testimony indicating the proliferation of services that has occurred under area agency administration. One respondent recalled that, prior to area agencies, services to the elderly in his area simply were nonexistent.

Area agency supporters also accented the feeling that area agencies are essential to the well-being of remote, needy senior citizens because of their roles as information clearinghouses and senior citizen advocates. The testimony indicates that senior center directors rely heavily on area directors for current information, technical assistance, and a means to relay grievances to state and federal officials. Many feel that without this function smaller counties would lose an active, unified voice in the decision-making process.

Other comments from supporters of the area agencies indicate a belief that the costs for administration of the program under a single area director are less than if all counties were to assume these responsibilities on their own. Many feel that smaller, more rural counties simply could not support

the program internally in the absence of area agencies. Also, several respondents felt that if area agencies were abolished the only county department capable of picking up the program would be the welfare department, in which case many current recipients would drop out of the program.

Proponents of direct funding have argued that elimination of area agencies will reduce unnecessary administrative costs, freeing up additional dollars for program costs. They argue that most of the administrative paperwork currently is being done by senior center directors and other providers who forward the information to the state through area agencies. This information could just as easily be forwarded directly or through county offices.

Direct funding proponents also feel that, because representation on planning boards is not representative of population, those counties contributing more towards administration are not receiving a fair share of program funds.

One proponent of direct funding argued that, while area agencies were necessary and instrumental in getting the program off the ground, they have now fulfilled their function and should turn the program over to county officials more capable of judging the needs of the local populace.

Following is a summary of the written testimony received from participants in the September 3, 1982 hearing, and of correspondence received (mostly from county commissioners) prior to the hearing. The correspondence from county commissioners for the most part simply provide an indication of which administrative structure was favored in the county.

Summary of Testimony (Written)
Aging Services Hearing
September 3, 1982

A. Pro Area Agencies

1. Dorothy Cook; President, Teton County Council on Aging.

   a. Program is already administered efficiently.

   b. Loss of personal contact under SRS administration.

   c. Loss of volunteers under SRS administration.

   d. Set up autonomous department on aging services.

2. Maurice Fleming; County Commissioner, Custer County.

   a. Smaller counties far from Helena need the advocacy role provided by area agencies.

   b. Smaller counties alone cannot support area agencies.

3. Ida Bartley; Senior Citizen, Big Timber. Keep the area plan as it is working very well. (Max Officer, John Johnson, Oline Maer Freye, Byarne Bjorndal - all agree). Yvonne Manson - the area agencies do the best job because they are designed to concentrate on a single function--providing services to the elderly.

4. Sarah Coleman; Director, Golden Valley Senior Center.

   a. The value in area agencies is in their ability to act as an information clearinghouse and in their advocacy role. Senior center directors are in constant contact with the area agency, receiving and then implementing information which entices senior citizens to become actively involved.

   b. Turning the programs over to the counties will result in welfare office administration effectively killing the program.

5. Doris E. Lawrence; Secretary-Treasurer, Choteau Council on Aging.

   a. The amount of money paid for administration ($875 a year) to the area agency would never fund the additional people that would be required at the county level to take over the program.

   b. The program is working well as it is, do not try to fix it.

6. Lucille Van Alstine; Board Chairman, Cut Bank.

   a. Because of the rurality aspect, senior citizens in Cut Bank would not enjoy the consideration they receive presently in the absence of an area agency.

   b. No one has submitted documentation showing that direct funding is more efficient.

7. George Puharb; V.P., Bozeman Senior Social Center. Supports the structure that existed prior to July 1, 1982.

8. Jim Rowlan, Lake County Council on Aging.

   a. A single director for five counties and the tribe is more beneficial than six directors.

   b. Under direct funding there is a dispersion of leadership.

   c. Senior citizens will not utilize services offered through a welfare office.

   d. The area agency plan works; why change it?

9. Tom Sherrard, Toole County Commissioner.

   a. Prior to the existence of area agencies, there were no senior programs - the seven counties remaining under Area III all wish to continue under the area agency structure to insure that there will be senior programs in the future.

b. Projected administration costs for fiscal 1983 are $10,000 for the area agency, no way could seven offices be administered for $10,000.

c. Establish a department or agency separate from SRS.

10. Mildred Terdahl, Libby. The only county department capable of assuming the task of administering the program is the welfare department. Giving the program to the welfare department would result in losing 50 percent of the senior citizens currently participating. The area agency structure has worked so well in the past; why change it?

11. Norma Keil; Chairman, Pondera County Council on Aging.

a. Area agencies provide a focal point for the concerns of senior citizens and also act to provide the technical assistance and information needed to effectively operate the agency services program.

b. Many small counties operate with volunteers and do not have staff capable of assuming area agency responsibilities in the event of direct funding.

12. Maggie Driscoll, District XII HRDC. Supports the area agency concept.

13. Lori Brengle; Director, Area I Agency on Aging.

a. The number of area agencies should be determined by cost effectiveness quidelines.

b. Under a single, state PSA, rural counties far from Helena would lose an active, unified voice in the decision-making process.

14. Stan Rogers, Area II Senior Citizens Advocate.

    a. The program is working well in Area II.

    b. Administrative costs are very reasonable given the extent of the program.

    c. Under direct funding, smaller counties would find it increasingly difficult to support an area agency.

15. Oleta Smith, Senior Citizen.

    a. Grass-roots seniors have repeatedly supported the area agency concept because they have found it instrumental in providing the leadership and support needed in caring for isolated and needy.

    b. How can one question the efficiency of the area agency structure given that, statewide, total administrative costs are only 6.33 percent of total program costs?

16. Lois C. Shorey; State Director, American Association of Retired Persons.

    a. The area agency structure has worked so well in the past; why change it?

    b. Without the support of the larger counties, smaller counties could not support area agencies.

17. A.C. Grande, Jr; Chairman, Board of County Commissioners, Meagher County. Supports area agency structure.

18. Ray W. McCaffree; Chairman, Musselshell County Commissioners

19. Board of County Commissioners, Sweet Grass County.

B. Pro Direct Funding

1. Betty Fitzner; Senior Citizen, St. Ignatius. Eliminating intermediate bureaucratic layers will provide more dollars for program funds.

2. Helen G. O'Connell; State Representative, District 34, Great Falls.

   a. Who better understands the needs of county people than local administrators and community people?

   b. Funding does not have to go through county welfare offices; senior citizen center managers are already filling out reports. What difference does it make if the reports are sent to the state through county offices rather than through area agencies?

   c. Eliminating area agencies would reduce administrative costs, freeing additional dollars for program costs.

3. Art Rambo; County Commissioner, Hill County.

   a. Every service provider is responsible for providing accountability and monthly reporting to the area agency, who in turn recompiles this information and forwards it to the state. This could just as easily be done by direct forwarding to the state for compilation or through county offices with no additions to staff required.

4. Bill Gould, Lincoln County Commissioner.

   a. While area agencies were necessary and instrumental in developing a network for the provision of services to the elderly, the program has reached the stage where area agencies, having fulfilled their obligations, are no longer necessary for the efficient management of the program.

   b. The area board is a cumbersome decision-making structure with large population counties unfairly represented.

c. Eliminating area agencies would substantially reduce travel costs.

d. The dollars paid by some counties for administration far exceed services rendered.

e. The allocation of dollars within an area is often times unfair, with, generally, the larger counties being short changed.

f. The area board's quality of decisions suffers due to a frequently changing make-up of often poorly informed participants.

5. Kareen Bratt; Coordinator, Flathead County Council on Aging.

a. Because of the voting pattern established at the area board, Flathead County Council decided they could have no positive impact on decision-making. Consequently, they decided to apply for direct funding.

Summary of Testimony (Written)
Received Prior to September 3, 1982 hearing.

A. Pro Area Agencies

1. Edna I. Lanning, Park County representative to the Area IV Governing Board.
2. Bernice McGee, Area IV Senior Citizen.
3. William Macmillian; Chairman; Area IV Governing Board.
4. Barbara Card; Coordinator, Big Horn County Council on Aging.
5. Alvin Mathison, John Devier, Robert Ziegler; Dawson County Commissioners.
6. Executive Board, Gallatin County Council on Aging.
7. Lake County Council on Aging.
8. Board of County Commissioners, Yellowstone County.

B. Pro Direct Funding.

1. Morris Billehus; Chairman, Board of County Commissioners, Daniels County.
2. Gary Lang; Chairman, Fallon County Commissioners.
3. Board of County Commissioners, Phillips County.
4. Board of County Commissioners, Sheridan County.
5. Board of County Commissioners, Roosevelt County.

MONTANA POPULATION AGED 60 AND OVER BY COUNTY AND PLANNING AND SERVICE AREA

MONTANA POPULATION AGED 60 AND OVER BY COUNTY FOR 1970 and 1980

	County	1970	1980		County	1970	1980
1.	Beaverhead	1,264	1,343	29.	Madison	1,017	1,185
2.	Big Horn	1,055	1,299	30.	Meagher	356	389
3.	Blaine	1,040	1,143	31.	Mineral	364	497
4.	Broadwater	449	578	32.	Missoula	6,356	8,655
5.	Carbon	1,710	1,907	33.	Musselshell	839	947
6.	Carter	369	368	34.	Park	2,254	2,493
7.	Cascade	9,141	11,310	35.	Petroleum	93	103
8.	Chouteau	1,017	1,164	36.	Phillips	959	988
9.	Custer	2,039	2,403	37.	Pondera	969	1,160
10.	Daniels	586	631	38.	Power River	317	378
11.	Dawson	1,419	1,625	39.	Powell	961	1,133
12.	Deer Lodge	2,778	2,564	40.	Prairie	346	449
13.	Fallon	525	567	41.	Ravalli	2,892	4,159
14.	Fergus	2,432	2,819	42.	Richland	1,491	1,736
15.	Flathead	5,707	7,653	43.	Roosevelt	1,365	1,522
16.	Gallatin	3,565	4,613	44.	Rosebud	830	893
17.	Garfield	242	281	45.	Sanders	1,329	1,617
18.	Glacier	1,213	1,399	45.	Sheridan	938	1,164
19.	Golden Valley	181	208	47.	Silver Bow	7,219	7,922
20.	Granite	441	548	48.	Stillwater	926	1,192
21.	Hill	2,098	2,452	49.	Sweetgrass	667	790
22.	Jefferson	676	913	50.	Teton	1,067	1,312
23.	Judith Basin	521	538	51.	Toole	836	963
24.	Lake	2,700	3,579	52.	Treasure	175	178
25.	Lewis & Clark	4,671	5,896	53.	Valley	1,412	1,630
26.	Liberty	277	378	54.	Wheatland	475	528
27.	Lincoln	1,553	2,167	55.	Wibaux	253	275
28.	McCone	396	426	56.	Yellowstone	10,397	14,177
				57.	Yellowstone National Park	3	33

MONTANA POPULATION AGED 60 AND OVER
BY PLANNING AND SERVICE AREA
FOR 1970 AND 1980

Planning and Service Area	1970	1980
Area 1	13,662	15,514
Area 2	19,296	24,508
Area 3	6,419	7,519
Area 4	11,971	14,882
Area 5	13,680	14,695
Area 6	8,838	12,019
Area 7	-----	1,758
Hill County	2,098	2,452
Cascade County	9,141	11,310
Missoula County	6,356	8,655
Flathead County	5,707	7,653
Total	97,168	119,207

LEF:jt:z